Proposed Questions for July 9, 2007 Workshop

General Review

1. Do the scenario results indicate that estimated responses to existing policies are likely to lead to acceptable outcomes, or are new policies needed? Has passage of AB 32 (2006), and its focus on GHG emission reductions, essentially redefined what is considered an acceptable outcome?

2. How do the input assumptions and results of the Scenario Project differ from those of other similar studies, and what insights can we gain from these differences and similarities?

3. How can the insights gained from examining the results of the scenario project be used to 1) determine if new policies should be implemented or existing policies changed and 2) how to fashion these changes and new policies so they are adaptive (are flexible enough to change as knowledge about the future changes) and robust enough to avoid bad outcomes under a wide range of plausible futures.

Applicability to GHG Emission Reduction Strategies

4. Are the results of the scenario project suitable for use in estimating the consequences of additional large scale penetration of energy efficiency, rooftop solar photovoltaic, and supply-side renewable generation that LSEs might pursue in compliance with a load-based interpretation of AB 32 carbon emission reduction requirements?

5. Are the results of the Scenario Project likely to be useful to the inter-agency team (CARB, CPUC and Energy Commission) in understanding the potential cost consequences of additional large scale penetration of EE, rooftop PV, or supply-side renewables as GHG emission reduction measures?

6. Are the results of the scenario project useful in determining the GHG abatement measure supply curve for large LSEs? Can/should large LSEs be provided an opportunity to develop the impacts of such measures for themselves while at the same time using results from broad studies like this for smaller LSEs lacking adequate resources to conduct these analyses?

7. Are there specific design or data limitations that limit the usefulness of applying results to LSEs? Could such limitations be reduced or eliminated by further analyses? What is the timeframe required to conduct these additional analyses?

Applicability to Renewable Assessment Studies

8. The Energy Commission's PIER program has funded an Intermittacy Analysis Project (IAP) to determine how the variability of wind and solar resources affects

system operations and transmission development. Can the IAP results and the Scenario Project results be integrated? How do these two studies provide guidance about further assessment examining the potential impacts of mandating higher penetration of "as available" renewables?

9. The Energy Commission has been directed by the Governor to provide a report based on Assembly Bill 1585 (Blakesly and Levine), Statutes of 2005, which includes assessment of the "potential impacts upon the rates of electrical corporations and whether or not a renewable energy public goods charge is necessary to fund the above-market costs of electricity generated from eligible renewable energy resources" that result from a 33% by 2020 renewable portfolio standard. To what extent is this Scenario Project useful in providing inputs to that assessment?

Stepping Stone Toward Future IEPR Assessments

10. The Scenario Project reports and supporting documentation describe sensitivities that assess fuel prices, and "shocks" to the baseline assumptions that give some degree of information about variability of results. What other variables ought to have been assessed in this manner? Regardless of any limitations on the uncertainty of such variables, is sufficient information about alternatives available that a sensitivity assessment was feasible? If not, what other methods might be employed to expressly account for plausible ranges of uncertainty in input assumptions?

11. The Energy Commission Staff reported work on a separate portfolio assessment project that seemingly guides how risks can be evaluated to identify a preferred resource mix. Can the results of the Scenario Project be packaged into the framework of portfolio analyses? If insufficient assessments have been completed in the results reported in the June 2007 report, what supplemental analyses would need to be prepared to allow a portfolio method to be applied in future IEPR cycles?